REMARKS

Claims 1-6, previously pending in the present application, are cancelled herewith. New Claims 7-11 are added. New Claim 7 incorporates the subject matter of original Claim 1 into original Claim 4, with additional language to indicate that the molded article is transparent. No new matter is added; support for this amendment can be found in the specification at page 17, table 2, which shows that the inventive compositions, when formulated into molded articles, had a light transmittance of 87.0% (Compound no. 2) and 86.2% (Compound no. 4) at 0 hours of weathering, and a light transmittance of 65.0% (Compound no. 2) and 65.2% (Compound no. 4) at 6300 hours of weathering. Thus, molded articles formed from the compositions of the invention are transparent. Claims 8-11 incorporate subject matter found in original Claims 2, 3, 5 and 6.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C §103

In the Office Action dated September 6, 2005 ("the first office action"), Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,837,757 (Nodera et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,129,412 (Gunther et al.) and U.S. Patent No. 4,447,350 (Martini et al.). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as it may pertain to the new claims.

In the present invention, and as now recited in Claim 7, compounds of Formula 1 (or 2) are used to provide optical brightness in transparent molded articles made from thermoplastic molding compositions of poly(ester) carbonate. As indicated in the Background section of the specification, Applicants are aware that compounds of Formula 1 (one of which is commercially available under the trade name Hostalux® KCB) have been used in many other compositions. However, compounds of Formula 1 had not been used to brighten poly(ester) carbonate compositions (prior to the present invention), and their suitability for this purpose was heretofore unknown.

Nodera is cited for disclosure of polycarbonate compositions containing optical brighteners other than compounds of Formula 1; Gunther and Martini are cited for the teaching of Applicants' claimed Formula 1 compounds in textiles (Gunther) and polyamides/polyesters (Martini). It is asserted in the first office action that it would have been obvious to substitute the compounds of Gunther/Martini in

the compositions of Nodera, to provide optical brightness in poly(ester) carbonate compositions.

A *prima facie* case of obviousness such as the one asserted in the first office action can be overcome with a showing of unexpected results. Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to the data provided in the specification at pages 17-18. Table 2 shows the results of weathering tests on molded specimens made from compositions of the present invention. Compound 4 is Hostalux® KCB, a compound of Formula 1. It is compared to prior art compounds Hostalux® KSN (the compound shown in Nodera, Compound 3 in Table 2) and Uvitex® OB, another known optical brightener (Compound 1 in Table 2). As shown in Table 2, the molded article of the present invention provided superior weathering after 6300 hours, as compared to both prior art compounds, and in fact a 35% decrease in yellowness as compared to Hostalux® KSN is shown. In Table 3 on page 18 data on fluorescence of the articles after weathering is provided. The fluorescence of compound 4 can still be seen after 6300 hours of weathering, while the fluorescence of the prior art compounds cannot. Thus, the molded articles of the present invention maintain their optical brightness (and attractive appearance) even after long periods of time, while the prior art compounds do not. This result could not have been predicted, based on the teachings of the prior art. Applicants respectfully submit that the *prima facie* obviousness rejection of the first office action cannot be maintained in view of the unexpected results provided in the application, and that Claims 7-11 are not obvious in view of Nodera as combined with Gunther and Martini.

In the Office Action dated February 21, 2006 ("the second office action"), Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,294,510 (Ueda et al.) in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,783,307 (Fagerburg et al.) Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In the present invention, Compounds of Formula 2 are also used to provide optical brightness in molded articles made from thermoplastic molding compositions of poly(ester) carbonate. As indicated in the Background section of the specification, Compounds of Formula 2 (one of which is commercially available under the trade name Leukopur®) have been used in many other compositions, but not, to Applicants' knowledge, with poly(ester) carbonate compositions.

Ueda is said to teach compounds of Formula 2 for use as optical brighteners. Ueda uses compounds of Formula 2 in electrophotography compositions, which have nothing to do with the thermoplastic molding compositions of the present invention. Fagerburg is cited for the disclosure of optical brighteners in a UV-stabilized multi-layer structure. The multi-layer structure comprises a UV-protective layer having a UV-absorbing compound over a polymer layer of polyester, polycarbonate or acrylic. The purpose of the optical brightener in Fagerburg as described at column 3, lines 31-33, is to render the UV-protective layer visible to the eye, so that one can determine on which side of the multi-layer structure the UV-protective layer is present. The optical brightener is not described as providing resistance to weathering or yellowing.

Again, Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to the data provided in the application at pages 17-18. A compound of Formula 2, Leukopur®, is shown as Compound No. 2 in Tables 2 and 3. Leukopur® provides a 25% improvement over Hostalux® KSN and continues to fluoresce at 6300 hours, while the prior art compounds do not. Thus, molded articles of the present invention using compounds of Formula 2 also maintain their optical brightness (and attractive appearance) even after long periods of time, while the prior art compounds do not. This result could not have been predicted, based on the teachings of the prior art. Applicants respectfully submit that the *prima facie* obviousness rejection of the second office action also cannot be maintained in view of the unexpected results provided in the application, and that Claims 7-11 are not obvious in view of Ueda as combined with Fagerburg. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of all §103 rejections.

The present claims are also patentable over Hirai et al., U.S. 6,664,313. Hirai et al. disclose a polycarbonate resin composition comprising an aromatic polycarbonateresin, titanium, silica, a polyorganosioxane polymer, polytetrafluoro-ethylene and an optical brightener such as Hostalux® KCB. Molded articles made from the composition of Hirai et al. are opaque, whereas molded articles in the present invention are transparent. Hirai et al. do not teach or suggest molded articles having this property.

SUMMARY

Applicants respectfully submit that all outstanding issues have been addressed, and that Claims 7-11 are patentable over all references cited. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Joseph C. Gil
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 26,602

Bayer MaterialScience LLC
100 Bayer Road
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15205-9741
(412) 777-3808
FACSIMILE PHONE NUMBER:
(412) 777-3902

f:\shared\kpl\da218.rce